

TOTAL POPULAR VOTE CAST ON NOVEMBER 3

Increase for Republicans, Democrats and Socialists—Prohibitionists and Populists Suffer Heavy Losses.

Bryan Had 1,315,211 More Votes Than Parker, While Taft Led Roosevelt by 14,190—Some Close Contests.

New York, Dec. 15.—The total popular vote of the presidential candidates at the last national election was made known today in an official form, by the filing of the last of the official vote, that of Michigan. The total shows the following votes cast:

Taft, Republican, 6,837,676.
Bryan, Democrat, 6,330,182.
Debs, Socialist, 448,471.
Chafin, Prohibition, 241,252.
Higsen, Independence, 82,186.
Watson, Populist, 33,871.
Gilhaus, Social-Labor, 15,421.

Total for all candidates, 14,852,233.

This grand total exceeds by 1,341,531 the total number of votes cast in the presidential election of 1904, when the grand total was 13,510,708.

Compared with that election, the candidates of the Republican and Democratic and Socialist parties increased their vote this year. The reverse is true of the candidates of the Prohibition, Populist and Social-Labor parties. The Independence party did not figure in the presidential election four years ago.

Bryan Over Parker.

The biggest difference in a party vote is shown in an increase for Bryan of 1,315,211 over the total vote cast in 1904 for Alton B. Parker, the Democratic candidate. Taft received 14,190 votes more than were polled for President Roosevelt in 1904, and Debs ran 45,368 ahead of his predecessor on the Socialist ticket.

The heaviest loss is shown by the

Populist party, which, with the same candidates, registered 33,872 votes less this year than in 1904, when their total was 117,183. The Prohibitionist candidate, Chafin, ran 17,284 votes behind the 1904 mark of his party, and Gilhaus, the Socialist-Labor candidate, received only about 50 per cent of the vote given to Corrigan, which was 31,249, in the previous presidential race.

New York (870,070), Pennsylvania (745,779) and Illinois (629,332) gave Taft the greatest number of votes among the states, while as to Bryan the order was New York (667,468), Ohio (502,721) and Illinois (450,810).

Almost Tie in Two States.

The votes cast for Taft and Bryan were almost identical in number in two states, namely, Maryland and Nevada. In the first mentioned, Taft received 111,353 and Bryan 111,117, and in the other, 10,214 and 10,555, respectively.

Debs received his largest vote in Pennsylvania, 38,913; Illinois, 38,471, and New York, 38,457. Vermont was the only state in which not a single vote was cast for the Socialist candidate. Delaware gave him only seventy-five votes.

Higsen's vote in New York, 35,817, and in his own state, Massachusetts, 19,237, together formed nearly two-thirds of all the votes he received in the whole country. In six states not a vote was cast for him. Nine states registered not a single vote for the Prohibition candidates. The Socialist-Labor candidate received votes in only thirteen states, and in only nineteen states were votes cast for Watson of the Populist party.

STATE—	Taft (R.)	Bryan (D.)	Debs (Soc.)	Higsen (Ind.)	Chafin (Pro.)	Gilhaus (Soc. L.)
Alabama	56,447	71,774	5,000	500	1,000	500
Arkansas	182,064	107,770	18,736	4,377	6,443
California	379,709	325,448	13,974	519	553
Colorado	112,815	68,255	5,112	728	2,280
Connecticut	25,200	22,124	73	59	650
Delaware	19,634	31,161	7,777	553	1,356
Florida	379,709	325,448	13,974	519	553
Georgia	50,055	34,699	6,205	207	1,704
Idaho	62,902	45,810	39,711	7,724	29,364	633
Illinois	379,709	325,448	13,974	519	553
Indiana	275,210	290,771	8,287	404	9,837	281
Iowa	195,106	191,200	4,060	200	5,887	353
Kentucky	235,711	219,092	4,060	200	5,887	353
Louisiana	1,433	64,259	1,498	82	4,225
Maine	66,587	35,483	1,758	730	1,487
Maryland	111,353	111,117	2,900	429	2,099
Massachusetts	19,237	19,237
Michigan	333,313	174,413	14,469	523	10,154	1,096
Minnesota	195,756	190,433	14,469	523	10,154	1,096
Mississippi	1,433	64,259	1,498	82	4,225
Missouri	346,915	316,284	15,298	1,045	1,016
Montana	32,323	29,326	3,853	443	827
Nebraska	126,908	120,781	3,424	5,179
Nevada	10,214	10,555	1,016
New Hampshire	33,144	32,655	1,299	584	965
New Jersey	256,238	182,522	10,219	2,016	4,130	2,916
New York	667,468	502,721	39,711	55,317	22,967	8,877
North Carolina	114,587	126,928	3,424
North Dakota	57,771	32,900	2,405	78	1,453
Ohio	572,312	502,721	33,795	439	11,492	721
Oklahoma	119,359	125,907	2,752	274	434
Oregon	62,359	38,049	7,430	283	2,682
Pennsylvania	745,779	648,785	38,913	1,057	38,394	1,222
Rhode Island	43,942	21,796	1,262	1,045	1,016
South Carolina	3,847	62,289	101	43
South Dakota	67,466	40,296	2,846	88	4,299
Tennessee	118,287	133,630	1,578	322	296	1,081
Texas	69,329	297,384	8,323	194	1,792	3,388
Utah	61,028	42,601	4,895	87
Vermont	39,552	11,496	894	739
Virginia	32,572	32,946	51	1,111
Washington	108,062	58,383	14,777	248	4,799
West Virginia	137,869	111,418	3,076	46	8,107
Wisconsin	248,673	168,707	28,148	11,579
Wyoming	17,708	14,712	1,396	82
Totals	6,837,676	6,330,182	448,471	82,186	241,452	33,871
All candidates	14,852,233	15,421

TARIFF ON COAL.

Wyoming Operators Fear Loss of the Montana Market.

(Special to The Herald.)

Washington, Dec. 15.—At the request of Representative Mondell of Wyoming, B. W. Carney, W. H. Holbrook and W. McGrath, coal operators of northern Wyoming, are here to testify before the house ways and means committee in reference to the proposed removal of the tariff on coal. Representative Mondell said today:

Only one "BROMO QUININE" that is **Laxative Bromo Quinine** Cures a Cold in One Day, Grip in 2 Days

Bromo Quinine on every box, 25c

The reason why of **Hart Schaffner & Marx clothes**

Is found in the satisfied men who wear them. All that is best in workmanship, style and quality is embodied in these men's ready-to-wear garments

Santa Claus is having a busy time these days in this store.

Richardson & Adams Co
172 MAIN STREET

SAYS COST IS HIGHER NOW THAN IN 1899

Continued from Page 1.

Iron is \$14 a ton, as compared with \$8 a ton in 1899; while the cost of steel rails today is \$21.50 a ton, compared with \$12 a ton nine years ago.

Mr. Schwab replied to many questions bearing on the advisability of reducing the iron and steel tariff.

Mr. Schwab stated that in Germany the cost of producing pig iron is from \$9.50 to \$12 a ton, while the cost of conversion into steel is about the same as in this country. The cost of manufacture in England is a little less than in Germany.

"If the tariff on steel should be considerably reduced, would the steel business be seriously affected?" asked Mr. Hill of Connecticut.

Where Protection Comes In.

"If conditions are equal, we can make steel rails as cheaply as they can be made anywhere," replied Mr. Schwab. "The cost of the manufacturing of steel depends on two conditions, the cost of the material on the ground and the cost of labor. If these conditions are the same elsewhere, we don't need the tariff, but if the cost of transportation or labor or something is greater here, we need a tariff for protection."

Mr. Schwab claimed that he was not aware of any understanding between the United States Steel corporation and the German steel syndicate and the English rail syndicate.

Mr. Schwab said that the price of steel rails was fixed by most of the American manufacturers at \$25 in 1899 or 1896, that in 1900 the cost of the property, which was owned by the French company, and to see that the title was clear. These transactions were carried on openly and published in detail in the *Financial Review* of the interests of the old Panama company was concerned with the liquidation appointed by the proper French governmental body, the civil tribunal of the Seine, and it was the decree of the same tribunal, with the new Panama Canal company, which also went into liquidation upon the sale to the United States. All transactions were carried on openly, and were published in detail.

Conditions Abroad.

Referring again to foreign countries, Mr. Schwab said:

"The labor conditions in England are the worst of any manufacturing country in the world." He said that the German government does more than that the steel makers in that country are farther advanced in the methods of manufacture than those in this country.

"Is the tariff balanced between pig iron and steel rails?" asked Representative Hill.

"The differential between rails and rolled steel products is fair," stated Mr. Schwab, replying affirmatively.

Mr. Schwab stated that the average manufacturer is entitled to a profit of 15 to 20 per cent, and that the most successful manufacturers should have 25 per cent net profit. Mr. Schwab stated that of the \$400,000,000 in value of the reduction in the price of steel rails.

He testified that the United States Steel corporation manufactured 40 to 55 per cent of the steel produced in this country.

Tennessee Company Not Included.

"Does that include the production of the Tennessee company, the purchase of which was claimed by the president?" asked Mr. Clark of Missouri.

"No, it does not; although I don't know anything about the president consenting to the purchase," replied Mr. Schwab.

Giving many valuable arguments in favor of reductions in the tariff, Frank W. Taussig, professor of political economy at Harvard university, argued that certain raw materials should be admitted free, naming coal, iron ore, lumber, hemp, flax, corn, barley, oats and wool. He said it would be a wise policy to reduce the duty on woolen clothing and sugar.

Referring to Mr. Schwab's testimony, he said he thought "the same watchfulness should attach to Mr. Schwab's testimony today as to the letter he wrote to Mr. Prick in 1899. He was a little biased then, and I think he is a little biased the other way now." Professor Taussig declared that it is a question whether in the end a protective tariff works a benefit to the country at large.

PANAMA CANAL MESSAGE READ TO CONGRESS

Continued from Page 1.

had not taken the trouble to find out the fact that Mr. Robinson had not had the slightest connection, public or private, of any kind or sort with any phase of the Panama transaction from beginning to end. The men who attacked Mr. Root in the matter had not taken the trouble to read the public documents which Mr. Robinson had been given, and which he had been given to them that Mr. Root had nothing to do with the purchase, which was entirely arranged through the department of justice under then Attorney General Knox.

Infamous Libels.

"Now, these stories, as a matter of fact, need no investigation whatever. No shadow of proof has been, or can be produced in behalf of any of them. They consist mainly of a string of infamous libels. In form they are partly libels upon Mr. Taft and Mr. Robinson, for instance, but they are in fact wholly, and in form partly, a libel upon the United States government. I do not believe we should concern ourselves with the particular individuals who wrote the lying and libelous editorials in the news columns. The real offender is Joseph Pulitzer, editor and proprietor of the *World*. While the criminal offense of which Mr. Pulitzer has been guilty is in form a libel upon individuals, the great injury done is in blackening the good name of the American people. It should not be left to a private citizen to sue Mr. Pulitzer for libel. He should be prosecuted for libel by the governmental authorities. In point of encouragement of iniquity, in point of infamy, of wrong doing, there is nothing more heinous than to convict a high national duty to bring to justice this villifier of the American people, this man who wantonly and wickedly and without any shadow of justification seeks to blacken the character of reputable private citizens and to convict the government of his own country in the eyes of the civilized world of wrong doing of the basest and foulest kind when he has not one shadow of justification of any sort or description of charge he has made. The attorney general has under consideration the form under which the proceedings against Mr. Pulitzer shall be brought."

Papers Transmitted.

The president refers to various papers which he transmits with his message, and calls attention to numerous utterances and acts relating to the canal and its purchase. He cites the act of congress by which it was authorized to pay \$40,000,000 for the canal

property; and says it was no concern of the president what the new Panama Canal company did with the money.

Explaining the method of concluding the purchase, the president says:

"The Panama canal transaction was actually carried through not by either the then secretary of state, John Hay, or the then secretary of war, Elihu Root, both of whom, however, were cognizant of all the essential features; but by the then attorney general, P. C. Knox, at present senator from Pennsylvania. I directed or approved every action, and am responsible for all that was done in carrying out the will of the congress; and the provisions of the law, enacted by congress after exhaustive examination and discussion, were scrupulously complied with by the executive. While the transaction was pending I saw Mr. Cromwell but two or three times, and my communications with him were limited to the exchange of purely formal courtesies. Secretary Hay occasionally saw him in the same manner; I doubt whether Mr. Root held any conversation with him. The attorney general saw him frequently, as he is counsel for the Panama company; the communications were official as representing the two sides."

Government Not Influenced.

"The action of the government, he says, was not influenced by any question of who were or were not stockholders either in the new or old company."

"As a matter of fact," he explains, "the canal company, new or old, had been owned by American citizens or by citizens of any other nationality. It would not have altered in the slightest degree the action taken by this government. Our one letter to the French government, which was owned by the French company, and to see that the title was clear. These transactions were carried on openly and published in detail in the *Financial Review* of the interests of the old Panama company was concerned with the liquidation appointed by the proper French governmental body, the civil tribunal of the Seine, and it was the decree of the same tribunal, with the new Panama Canal company, which also went into liquidation upon the sale to the United States. All transactions were carried on openly, and were published in detail."

Morgan Handled the Money.

The president states that the money was paid through the New York banking house of J. Pierpont Morgan into the Bank of France in Paris.

"These payments," he says, "were made in accordance with the following: The French government, the government of the United States, the king of Great Britain nor the German emperor would venture to arrogate such power to himself. John Adams, the father of the republic, had no authority to enforce the Federalist party in America. Yet Mr. Roosevelt, in the absence of law, felt it proper to use all the power of the greatest government on earth to cripple the freedom of the press on the pretext that the government had been libeled and he is the government."

"I wish to make as clear as possible, and as emphatic as possible, the statement that we did not have anything to do with the distribution of a dollar of the \$400,000,000 in value of the reduction in the price of steel rails."

Mr. Schwab stated that the average manufacturer is entitled to a profit of 15 to 20 per cent, and that the most successful manufacturers should have 25 per cent net profit. Mr. Schwab stated that of the \$400,000,000 in value of the reduction in the price of steel rails.

He testified that the United States Steel corporation manufactured 40 to 55 per cent of the steel produced in this country.

Tennessee Company Not Included.

"Does that include the production of the Tennessee company, the purchase of which was claimed by the president?" asked Mr. Clark of Missouri.

"No, it does not; although I don't know anything about the president consenting to the purchase," replied Mr. Schwab.

Giving many valuable arguments in favor of reductions in the tariff, Frank W. Taussig, professor of political economy at Harvard university, argued that certain raw materials should be admitted free, naming coal, iron ore, lumber, hemp, flax, corn, barley, oats and wool. He said it would be a wise policy to reduce the duty on woolen clothing and sugar.

Referring to Mr. Schwab's testimony, he said he thought "the same watchfulness should attach to Mr. Schwab's testimony today as to the letter he wrote to Mr. Prick in 1899. He was a little biased then, and I think he is a little biased the other way now." Professor Taussig declared that it is a question whether in the end a protective tariff works a benefit to the country at large.

PANAMA CANAL MESSAGE READ TO CONGRESS

Continued from Page 1.

had not taken the trouble to find out the fact that Mr. Robinson had not had the slightest connection, public or private, of any kind or sort with any phase of the Panama transaction from beginning to end. The men who attacked Mr. Root in the matter had not taken the trouble to read the public documents which Mr. Robinson had been given, and which he had been given to them that Mr. Root had nothing to do with the purchase, which was entirely arranged through the department of justice under then Attorney General Knox.

Infamous Libels.

"Now, these stories, as a matter of fact, need no investigation whatever. No shadow of proof has been, or can be produced in behalf of any of them. They consist mainly of a string of infamous libels. In form they are partly libels upon Mr. Taft and Mr. Robinson, for instance, but they are in fact wholly, and in form partly, a libel upon the United States government. I do not believe we should concern ourselves with the particular individuals who wrote the lying and libelous editorials in the news columns. The real offender is Joseph Pulitzer, editor and proprietor of the *World*. While the criminal offense of which Mr. Pulitzer has been guilty is in form a libel upon individuals, the great injury done is in blackening the good name of the American people. It should not be left to a private citizen to sue Mr. Pulitzer for libel. He should be prosecuted for libel by the governmental authorities. In point of encouragement of iniquity, in point of infamy, of wrong doing, there is nothing more heinous than to convict a high national duty to bring to justice this villifier of the American people, this man who wantonly and wickedly and without any shadow of justification seeks to blacken the character of reputable private citizens and to convict the government of his own country in the eyes of the civilized world of wrong doing of the basest and foulest kind when he has not one shadow of justification of any sort or description of charge he has made. The attorney general has under consideration the form under which the proceedings against Mr. Pulitzer shall be brought."

Papers Transmitted.

The president refers to various papers which he transmits with his message, and calls attention to numerous utterances and acts relating to the canal and its purchase. He cites the act of congress by which it was authorized to pay \$40,000,000 for the canal

property; and says it was no concern of the president what the new Panama Canal company did with the money.

Explaining the method of concluding the purchase, the president says:

"The Panama canal transaction was actually carried through not by either the then secretary of state, John Hay, or the then secretary of war, Elihu Root, both of whom, however, were cognizant of all the essential features; but by the then attorney general, P. C. Knox, at present senator from Pennsylvania. I directed or approved every action, and am responsible for all that was done in carrying out the will of the congress; and the provisions of the law, enacted by congress after exhaustive examination and discussion, were scrupulously complied with by the executive. While the transaction was pending I saw Mr. Cromwell but two or three times, and my communications with him were limited to the exchange of purely formal courtesies. Secretary Hay occasionally saw him in the same manner; I doubt whether Mr. Root held any conversation with him. The attorney general saw him frequently, as he is counsel for the Panama company; the communications were official as representing the two sides."

Government Not Influenced.

"The action of the government, he says, was not influenced by any question of who were or were not stockholders either in the new or old company."

"As a matter of fact," he explains, "the canal company, new or old, had been owned by American citizens or by citizens of any other nationality. It would not have altered in the slightest degree the action taken by this government. Our one letter to the French government, which was owned by the French company, and to see that the title was clear. These transactions were carried on openly and published in detail in the *Financial Review* of the interests of the old Panama company was concerned with the liquidation appointed by the proper French governmental body, the civil tribunal of the Seine, and it was the decree of the same tribunal, with the new Panama Canal company, which also went into liquidation upon the sale to the United States. All transactions were carried on openly, and were published in detail."

Morgan Handled the Money.

The president states that the money was paid through the New York banking house of J. Pierpont Morgan into the Bank of France in Paris.

"These payments," he says, "were made in accordance with the following: The French government, the government of the United States, the king of Great Britain nor the German emperor would venture to arrogate such power to himself. John Adams, the father of the republic, had no authority to enforce the Federalist party in America. Yet Mr. Roosevelt, in the absence of law, felt it proper to use all the power of the greatest government on earth to cripple the freedom of the press on the pretext that the government had been libeled and he is the government."

"I wish to make as clear as possible, and as emphatic as possible, the statement that we did not have anything to do with the distribution of a dollar of the \$400,000,000 in value of the reduction in the price of steel rails."

Mr. Schwab stated that the average manufacturer is entitled to a profit of 15 to 20 per cent, and that the most successful manufacturers should have 25 per cent net profit. Mr. Schwab stated that of the \$400,000,000 in value of the reduction in the price of steel rails.

He testified that the United States Steel corporation manufactured 40 to 55 per cent of the steel produced in this country.

Tennessee Company Not Included.

"Does that include the production of the Tennessee company, the purchase of which was claimed by the president?" asked Mr. Clark of Missouri.

"No, it does not; although I don't know anything about the president consenting to the purchase," replied Mr. Schwab.

Giving many valuable arguments in favor of reductions in the tariff, Frank W. Taussig, professor of political economy at Harvard university, argued that certain raw materials should be admitted free, naming coal, iron ore, lumber, hemp, flax, corn, barley, oats and wool. He said it would be a wise policy to reduce the duty on woolen clothing and sugar.

Referring to Mr. Schwab's testimony, he said he thought "the same watchfulness should attach to Mr. Schwab's testimony today as to the letter he wrote to Mr. Prick in 1899. He was a little biased then, and I think he is a little biased the other way now." Professor Taussig declared that it is a question whether in the end a protective tariff works a benefit to the country at large.

PANAMA CANAL MESSAGE READ TO CONGRESS

Continued from Page 1.

had not taken the trouble to find out the fact that Mr. Robinson had not had the slightest connection, public or private, of any kind or sort with any phase of the Panama transaction from beginning to end. The men who attacked Mr. Root in the matter had not taken the trouble to read the public documents which Mr. Robinson had been given, and which he had been given to them that Mr. Root had nothing to do with the purchase, which was entirely arranged through the department of justice under then Attorney General Knox.

Infamous Libels.

"Now, these stories, as a matter of fact, need no investigation whatever. No shadow of proof has been, or can be produced in behalf of any of them. They consist mainly of a string of infamous libels. In form they are partly libels upon Mr. Taft and Mr. Robinson, for instance, but they are in fact wholly, and in form partly, a libel upon the United States government. I do not believe we should concern ourselves with the particular individuals who wrote the lying and libelous editorials in the news columns. The real offender is Joseph Pulitzer, editor and proprietor of the *World*. While the criminal offense of which Mr. Pulitzer has been guilty is in form a libel upon individuals, the great injury done is in blackening the good name of the American people. It should not be left to a private citizen to sue Mr. Pulitzer for libel. He should be prosecuted for libel by the governmental authorities. In point of encouragement of iniquity, in point of infamy, of wrong doing, there is nothing more heinous than to convict a high national duty to bring to justice this villifier of the American people, this man who wantonly and wickedly and without any shadow of justification seeks to blacken the character of reputable private citizens and to convict the government of his own country in the eyes of the civilized world of wrong doing of the basest and foulest kind when he has not one shadow of justification of any sort or description of charge he has made. The attorney general has under consideration the form under which the proceedings against Mr. Pulitzer shall be brought."

Papers Transmitted.

The president refers to various papers which he transmits with his message, and calls attention to numerous utterances and acts relating to the canal and its purchase. He cites the act of congress by which it was authorized to pay \$40,000,000 for the canal

ONE COUNTRY ONE FLAG AND ONE PURPOSE

Continued from Page 1.

so widely discussed. It is true that it is ancient of origin, but we have gotten along pretty well under it. There have been problems in the past which seemed as difficult as that of the "twilight zone" and proper apportionment of state and federal power, but they have been settled. And I think now we can depend upon the acumen, the patriotism and the ability of the members of the supreme court of the United States to recognize that in our progress they must so construe the constitution as to enable us to carry out the reforms that are needed as the nation advances, giving to the government the power of dealing broadly with the greater problems and the state power of dealing with the lesser ones.